

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Paul Higginbotham,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell Telephone Company,

Defendant.

Case 01-03-028
(Filed March 7, 2001)

Izu Klepper,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell Telephone Company,

Defendant.

Case 01-05-059
(Filed May 17, 2001)

Asha Goldberg,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell Telephone Company,

Defendant.

Case 01-05-068
(Filed May 28, 2001)

Raymond A. Chamberlin,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell Telephone Company,

Defendant.

Case 01-07-023
(Filed July 16, 2001)

Edward H. Joseph,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell Telephone Company,

Defendant.

Case 01-11-008
(Filed November 5, 2001)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
SETTING DATE FOR FILING RESPONSES**

The appendix to this ruling is a copy of a declaration from Commission staff member Betty Brandel. Parties may file and serve responses to this declaration no later than June 28, 2002.

Attachment A to the declaration contains customer identifying information which has been redacted from all copies of this ruling with the exception of the copy directed to Pacific Bell and the filed copy. Pacific Bell shall not repeat any customer identifying information in any filed document. Attachment A of the filed copy shall be held under seal. Attachment A shall remain under seal for a period of two years from the date of this ruling, and during that period shall not

be made accessible or disclosed to anyone other than Commission staff except on the further order or ruling of the Commission, the Assigned Commissioner, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), or the ALJ then designated as Law and Motion Judge.

Dated June 13, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARIBETH A. BUSHEY

Maribeth A. Bushey
Administrative Law Judge

APPENDIX
Declaration From Commission Staff Member Betty Brandel

I, Betty Brandel, declare the following:

1. I am employed by the California Public Utilities Commission in the Consumer Affairs Branch. As part of my duties, I receive informal complaints from customers of public utilities, including Pacific Bell Telephone Company. I try to resolve the complaints through discussion with the utility.
2. I have received three informal complaints from Pacific Bell customers who say that they received wrong toll-free prefix information from Pacific Bell's "0" operators. The customers' telephone numbers are listed on Attachment A.
3. Customer 1 alleged that the Pacific Bell "0" operator had wrongly informed her that a particular number was toll-free, resulting in charges of over \$400 for calls to her internet service provider. To test the validity of this allegation, I called the operator and received the same erroneous information. I then contacted a Pacific Bell executive and, while that executive was on the line with me, contacted an operator, and again received erroneous information. I have been informed by Pacific Bell that this customer received a full refund.
4. Customer 2 alleged that when she was signing up for new dial-up internet service she attempted to find the toll-free prefix information in her directory but discovered that it had been discontinued. She stated that she

then contacted the “0” operator and was informed that a certain number was toll-free; however, after using this number to access her internet service provider, she received a bill from Pacific Bell for \$241. She explained that Pacific Bell refused to adjust her account because she had no evidence to back up her claim.

5. Customer 3 stated that when his internet service provider informed him that the access number he was then using was going to be discontinued, he looked in the directory for the toll-free local calling area but the information was not there. The customer stated that his wife contacted Pacific Bell, probably the “0” operator, and was told that there would be no additional charges for a particular number. Based on this information, the customer used that number to access his internet service provider. His next bill included over \$300 for local toll calls to that number.

I have read the foregoing and know the contents thereof and I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 11, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ BETTY BRANDEL
Betty Brandel

Attachment A
(redacted for all parties other than Pacific Bell)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

(END OF APPENDIX)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have by mail, and by electronic mail, to the parties to which an electronic mail address has been provided, this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Setting Date for Filing Responses on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated June 13, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ KE HUANG

Ke Huang

N O T I C E

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to ensure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074, TTY 1-866-836-7825 or (415) 703-5282 at least three working days in advance of the event.